UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO TREVOR CAWLEY, Plaintiff,	2015 JAN 28 PM 3: 12  CLETCAS TO STRICT COURT CLEVELAND CLEVELAND				
EASTMAN OUTDOORS, INC., ET AL.,	SPECIAL VERDICT FORM				
Defendants.	: : :				
	ROGATORIES  the construction or manufacture of the Wolverine				
6070 carbon arrow at issue in this case?					
Answer "Yes" or "No."  Answer:					
If your answer is "No," do not answer the	he remaining Interrogatories, and enter a general				
verdict for the defendant. Otherwise, pro	occed to Interrogatory No. 2.				
Interrogatory No. 2: If your answer to proximately cause injury to Plaintiff Tree	Interrogatory No. 1 was "Yes," did that defect				
Answer "Yes" or "No."	· ·				
Answer:					

Case No. 1:14-CV-00310 Gwin, J. If your answer is "No," do not answer the remaining Interrogatories, and enter a general verdict for the defendant. Otherwise, proceed to Interrogatory No. 3. Interrogatory No. 3: Did Plaintiff Trevor Cawley impliedly assume the risk of injury, and, if so, was that implied assumption of the risk a direct and proximate cause of his injury? Answer "Yes" or "No." Answer: If your answer is "Yes," do not answer the remaining Interrogatories, and enter a general verdict for the defendant. Otherwise, proceed to Interrogatory No. 4. Interrogatory No. 4: Was Plaintiff Trevor Cawley negligent, and did that negligence directly and proximately cause his own injury?

Answer "Yes" or "No."

Answer:

If your answer is "Yes," proceed to Interrogatory No. 5. Otherwise, enter a general verdict for the plaintiff, then skip Interrogatory No. 5 and go directly to Interrogatory No. 6.

Interrogatory No. 5: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 4 is "Yes," state the percentages of

Case No. 1:14-CV-00310 Gwin, J.
negligence of Plaintiff Trevor Cawley, Defendant Eastman Outdoors, Inc., and Shin Kwan
Corporation that directly and proximately caused Plaintiff's injury.
% Plaintiff Trevor Cawley
% Defendant Eastman Outdoors, Inc. And Shin Kwang Corporation
Total:100% (The sum of the percentages attributed to each must equal 100%)
If the percentage attributable to the plaintiff is 50% or less, enter a general verdict for th
plaintiff and then proceed to Interrogatory No. 6. If the percentage attributable to the plaintif
is more than 50%, do not answer the remaining Interrogatories, and enter a general verdic
for the defendant.
Interrogatory No. 6: State the total amount of economic and noneconomic losses, and the total
compensatory damages sustained by Plaintiff Trevor Cawley, without regard to the percentag
of negligence attributed to him in Interrogatory No. 5 (if applicable).
\$Economic Losses
\$Non-economic Losses
Total: \$ Compensatory Damages (The sum of economi
and non-economic losses)
Enter the amount of compensatory damages on the General Verdict, and proceed t
Interrogatory No. 7.

Case: 1:14-cv-00310-JG Doc #: 95 Filed: 01/28/15 4 of 5. PageID #: 3005

Case No. 1:14-CV-00310

Gwin, J.

Interrogatory No. 7: Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that the harm for which

you awarded compensatory damages was the result of misconduct by Defendant Eastman

Outdoors, Inc., that manifested a flagrant disregard for the safety of persons who might be

harmed by the Wolverine 6070 carbon arrow at issue in this case, such that punitive damages

should be awarded to Plaintiff Trevor Cawley?

Answer "Yes" or "No." Answer:

If your answer is "Yes," enter that finding on the General Verdict, and proceed to

Interrogatory No. 8. If your answer is "No," enter that finding on the General Verdict, and

do not answer Interrogatory No. 8.

Interrogatory No. 8: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 7 was "Yes," do you find that

Defendant Eastman Outdoors, Inc., is liable for Plaintiff Trevor Cawley's attorney's fees?

Answer "Yes" or "No."

Answer:

Proceed to the General Verdict.

Case No. 1:14-CV-00310

Gwin	, J.									
					GENE	RAL VER	DICT	~~~		
	Wc, 1	the Jury	, do he	reby fi	nd for t	he PLAINI	CIFE /	DEFENDANT	circle one).	
IF PC	OR TH	e plai	ntiff	:						
	Wc	find	that	the	total	amount	of	compensatory	damages	is
\$				, aa	decided	in Interro	gatory	Na. 6.		
	We f	Ind tha	t the de	fendai	nt IS / I	S NOT (di	rele or	ie) linble for pun	itive damage	s, as
decid	led in Y	nterrog	atory N	0.7.					المور ر	
	Each	of us J	urors co	ncurri	ng in sni	id verdict si	igns h	is/her name herete	this 28 de	y of
Janua	ıry, 201	5.							٠	
			2:							 